

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA**

Alfred Lee,	:	
	:	Civil Action No.: _____
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
Diversified Consultants, Inc.; and DOES	:	COMPLAINT
1-10, inclusive,	:	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Alfred Lee, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* ("FDCPA"), in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.

2. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

3. The Plaintiff, Alfred Lee (“Plaintiff”), is an adult individual residing in Oceansprings, Mississippi, and is a “consumer” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

4. Defendant Diversified Consultants, Inc. (“Diversified”), is a Georgia business entity with an address of 1201 Peachtree Street, NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30361, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

5. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by Diversified and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

6. Diversified at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

7. The Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the “Debt”) to an original creditor (the “Creditor”).

8. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

9. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Diversified for collection, or Diversified was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

10. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Diversified Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

11. In or around April 2014, Diversified began calling Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt.

12. Diversified called Plaintiff at an annoying and harassing rate, placing up to eight calls daily in an attempt to collect the Debt.

13. On more than one occasion, Diversified called Plaintiff prior to 8:00AM.

14. During more than one conversation, Diversified failed to identify the name of the company calling.

15. During a conversation with Diversified, Plaintiff told Diversified that he disputed the Debt.

16. Diversified failed to send Plaintiff written correspondence within five days of the initial conversation.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

17. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

18. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

19. The Defendants' conduct was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

20. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

21. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff before 8:00 a.m.

22. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.

23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6) in that Defendants placed calls to the Plaintiff without disclosing the identity of the debt collection agency.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendants used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a) in that Defendants failed to send Plaintiff an initial letter within five days of its initial contact with Plaintiff as required by law.

27. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

28. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) and O.C.G.A. § 10-1-399(a) against Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against Defendants;
4. Actual damages from Defendants for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff; and
5. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: August 8, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Sergei Lemberg, Esq.

Sergei Lemberg, Esq.
Attorney Bar No.: 598666
Attorney for Plaintiff Alfred Lee
LEMBERG LAW L.L.C.
1100 Summer Street, Third Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250 ext. 5500
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424
Email: slemberg@lemborglaw.com